

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

This Amendment and the following remarks are intended to fully respond to the Office Action mailed January 19, 2007. In that Office Action, claims 43-75 were examined, and all claims were rejected. More specifically, claims 43-75 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as they are allegedly not statutory. In this response, claims 43 and 57 have been amended and no claims have been added or cancelled.

Informal Interview with Examiner

Applicant wishes to thank the Examiner for the informal phone interview conducted on February 21, 2007. In the course of the interview, the Examiner suggested claim amendments which would overcome the § 101 rejection. These suggested amendments have been reflected in the current amendments.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 101

Claims 43-75 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as they are allegedly not statutory. The Examiner states that claims 43-75 are not statutory because they merely recite computing steps without producing any concrete, useful and tangible results and/or being limited to a practical application within the technological arts. As noted above, independent claims 43 and 57 have been amended as per the Examiner's suggestion to overcome the § 101 rejection. Thus, for at least this reason, claims 43 and 57 are patentable subject matter. Furthermore, all other claims, specifically claims 44-56 and 58-75, depend from either claim 43 or claim 57. Thus, for at least the same reason, these claims are also patentable subject matter. In light of the current amendments, this rejection is now moot.

Conclusion

This Amendment fully responds to the Office Action mailed on January 19, 2007. Still, that Office Action may contain arguments and rejections and that are not directly addressed by this Amendment due to the fact that they are rendered moot in light of the preceding arguments in favor of patentability. Hence, failure of this Amendment to directly address an argument raised in the Office Action should not be taken as an indication that the Applicant believes the argument has merit. Furthermore, the claims of the present application may include other

elements, not discussed in this Amendment, which are not shown, taught, or otherwise suggested by the art of record. Accordingly, the preceding arguments in favor of patentability are advanced without prejudice to other bases of patentability.

It is believed that no further fees are due with this Response. However, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any deficiencies or credit any overpayment with respect to this patent application to deposit account number 13-2725.

In light of the above remarks and amendments, it is believed that the application is now in condition for allowance and such action is respectfully requested. Should any additional issues need to be resolved, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attempt to resolve those issues.

Respectfully submitted,



Tadd F. Wilson, Reg. No. 54,544
MERCHANT & GOULD P.C.
P.O. Box 2903
Minneapolis, MN 55402-0903
303.357.1651

Dated: April 27, 2007

27488
